

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action mailed on April 5, 2005. In the office action the Examiner

- rejected claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zandman et al. (US 2001/0016369);
- objected to claims 4, 5 and 8-10 as being dependent upon rejected base claim; and
- allowed claims 12-15.

After entry of this amendment, the pending claims are: claims 2-15.

Overview of Changes to Claims

Claim 7 has been amended to clarify that “the interconnect extends across the one or more interior scribe lanes to electrically connect at least two semiconductor devices.” Support is found in previously presented claim 2. The amendment, therefore, does not constitute new matter.

35 USC 102(e) Rejection

In the office action the Examiner rejected claims 2-3, 6-7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Zandman et al. (US 2001/0016369). The Applicants disagree and traverse.

After entry of this reply, independent claims 2 and 7 contain the limitation of the interconnect extending across the one or more interior scribe lanes to electrically connect at least two semiconductor devices. Zandman et al. describes a fabrication method and apparatus for making a connection between a pad on a front surface of a die to a pad on a back surface of the die. In Zandman et al., each die includes a semiconductor device (paragraph 6, lines 4 and 5; paragraph 11, line 3). However, Zandman et al. does not disclose or suggest a connection between pads on “two semiconductor devices separated by one or more interior scribe lanes” (as required by claims 2 and 7).

The Applicants note that while Zandman et al. discloses a metal layer lining the bottoms and walls of trenches separating dies and extending onto a passivation layer on a surface of the dies (paragraph 12, lines 6-8), this is a normal artifact of the metal deposition process. Zandman does not use this metal layer to connect a pad on one die to a pad on

another die, i.e., it does not connect pads on two devices, and furthermore there is no suggestion in Zandman to do so.

In fact, Zandman teaches at paragraphs 0043-0044 that the wafer die are to be detached from each other by sawing them apart using a dicing saw. Clearly, since the wafer die are physically separated by dicing in Zandman, the connections required by the pending claims are not provided by Zandman.

Zandman et al. does not achieve all of the limitations of the independent claims 2 and 7. Since the dependent claims include the limitations of their parent claims, Zandman et al. does not achieve all the limitations of the dependent claims. Therefore, Zandman et al. does not anticipate these pending claims. Removal of this ground for rejection is requested.

Prior Art Made of Record

The Examiner indicates that a reference, US 6,594,818, not relied upon is considered pertinent to the present application. Under 37 CFR 1.111(b), "(t)he reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references" (emphasis added). It is respectfully noted that the office action did not apply any of these listed references to any of the pending claims. Nevertheless, the applicant observes that none of these cited references discloses or teaches alone or in combination all the limitations of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance of all of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-7501, if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining items.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 5, 2005



Gary S. Williams

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2 Palo Alto Square, Suite 700

3000 El Camino Real

Palo Alto, California 94306

(650) 843-4000

31,066

(Reg. No.)